

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Case No. 3:16CR0031  
Plaintiff, :  
vs. : District Judge Walter Herbert Rice  
Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington  
CHRISTIAN PADILLA, :  
Defendant. :

---

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

---

This case came on for hearing on May 13, 2016. The United States was represented by Assistant United States Attorney Brent Tabacchi, and Defendant was represented by Attorney Thomas Anderson.

The parties have entered into a plea agreement, which will be filed of record. The undersigned carefully inquired of Defendant regarding his understanding of the agreement as well as his competence to understand the agreement. Having fully inquired, the undersigned Judicial Officer finds that Defendant's tendered plea of guilty to Count 1 of the Information is knowing, intelligent and voluntary. Based on the statement of facts as set forth in the plea colloquy the undersigned finds that there is a sufficient factual basis for a finding of guilt as to the Count.

It is accordingly recommended that the Court accept the plea of guilty to Count 1

of the Information and find Defendant guilty as charged of Conspiracy to Knowingly and Intentionally Possess with Intent to Distribute Heroin in violation of Title 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and (b)(1)(c), all in violation of Title 21 U.S.C. §846.

Pending the Court's acceptance of Defendant's pleas, Defendant has been referred to the Probation Department for a pre-sentence investigation.

May 17, 2016

s/ Sharon L. Ovington  
Sharon L. Ovington  
United States Magistrate Judge

## **NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 49(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to **SEVENTEEN** days because this Report is being served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E), or (F). Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with a copy thereof.

Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).